

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/581,088	OSHITANI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Daniel C. Comings	3744

All Participants:

(1) Examiner Daniel Comings. (3) _____.

(2) Attorney Michael Schmidt. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 March 2010

Time: 10 AM EDT

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

62, 72 and 82

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Daniel C Comings/
Examiner, Art Unit 3744

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

As claim 62 is written as depending upon independent claim 22 but is presented following independent claim 59, clarification of the claim's dependency was requested.

Furthermore, an examiner's amendment was proposed to put the application in condition for allowance by correcting the dependency of claim 62 (if necessary) and cancelling dependent claim 82 (which teaches a vapor-liquid separator being disposed between an evaporator outlet and a compressor inlet but depends upon claim 72 which teaches the evaporator outlet being connected "directly" to this inlet and thus raises issues of indefiniteness under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112.)

After reviewing the applicants' files to determine the intent of these two claims, Attorney Schmidt confirmed that claim 62 should depend from claim 59 and gave consent for the cancellation of claim 82..